

Meeting of March 17 1969  
10:30 am

-5

(R. Kennedy) We are not proposing a major in this area; however, its inclusion might afford a minor that would support a related major. Our occupationally oriented students, too, can profit from such an addition to the curriculum. Such an offering strengthens a broadly based education and makes it more meaningful to our time. A single page in the catalogue would summarize our total offering in this area.

(R. Andreini) Who will coordinate the program?

(R. Kennedy) This will be handled according to existing personnel policies.

(H. Finch) Does this action represent a precedent in not going through Committee?

(R. Keif) The Executive Committee directs any consideration to the appropriate area for study. Time dictated that the Committee direct this request to the Senate as a whole.

6. M/S

R. Andreini/E. Smith

"To accept Attachment I, 11 March Agenda--i.e. more permissive minor requirement".

(C. Fisher) Proposed minor would probably not comply with the code.

(E. Smith) Elementary and Secondary Education majors will be most likely involved. A more stringent minor requirement limits their total educational base.

(A. Higdon) Too much flexibility allows those preparing for the professions to wander from their primary objective.

(R. Keif) Recess till 10:30 a.m. Monday, 17 March.  
(No objection.)

17 March, 1969, 10:30 a.m. - Recessed session to order by Rod Keif.

Senators present:

W. Alexander	R. Frost	J. Lowry	A. Rosen
R. Anderson	V. Gates	T. Meyers	E. Smith
R. Andreini	C. Gibson	H. Miles	H. Walker
A. Andreoli	D. Grant	B. Mounts	R. Wheeler
D. Andrews	A. Higdon	Ken Murray(ASI)	A. Wirshup
R. Asbury	C. Johnson	L. Osteyee	V. Wolcott
F. Clogston	R. Keif	R. Pautz	

Senators present: (Cont'd.)

D. Federer	D. Koberg	C. Piper	R. Ratcliffe
H. Finch	L. Lewellyn	M. Pfeiffer	
C. Fisher	B. Loughran	D. Price	

Guests:

O. Servatius	B. Roberts	P. Rabe	A. Butzbach
H. F. Smith	R. Carsel	W. Curtis	F. Tellev
J. Simmons	O. Johnson	W. Schroeder	H. Scales

E. 6. M/S (Cont'd.) R. Andreini/E. Smith

(R. Keif) The question before the Senate is a recommendation re the status of minor course of study--i.e. mandatory or permissive?

(R. Andreini) Title V does not dictate a minor.

(B. Loughran) A distinction should be made between a graduation minor and credential minor.

(W. Alexander) At Cal Poly we think of options-concentrations as "minors". If the term minor has no meaning then we shouldn't busy ourselves by writing legislation about it.

(E. Smith) Where does the domain for curriculum planning reside?

(There followed considerable discussion concerning the difference and increasing similarity between the BA and BS degrees. Specific examples were used of the minor in the case of BA degree in History. This conversation was concluded by recalling action taken in this regard by the Academic Council.)

M/S Failed 15-14 - 4 absentions D. Grant/ R. Ratcliffe

To qualify the amendment 1-b-a....24 units: "of which at least 15 units must be in 300 and/or 400 series courses".

(B. Loughran) Are we trying to second guess the type student that will seek this course--i.e. are we fearful of the presence of non-occupationally oriented candidates? Should this be the experience after a period of time (2 years) then revision could and would be in order.

(H. Walker) Note courses listed as electives; few are in the 300 and 400 series. The 15 unit requirement may impose a burden; 9 units would be more realistic.

M/S/U

D. Grant/C. Fisher

To amend to make the "minor" more permissive by changing "shall" to "may" and changing 15 units to 9 units in the 300-400 series.

M/S/U

C. Fisher/D. Price

To propose deletion of "#200" following "English" in B-1.

The document of revised guidelines for majors, options and concentrations was accepted, not unanimously, but without strong dissent, with the two amendments:

1. reduction of minors from 15 to 9 units in the 300-400 series,
2. deletion of "#200" following "English" under B-1.

7. M/S

R. Andreini/H. Walker

To update the Academic Master Plan by enhancement of curriculum as follows:

(To be presented to the Senate individually.)

- A. Agriculture - B.S. in Maricultural Engineering 1973.
- B. Engineering - B.S. in Measurement Science.
- C. Applied Arts - B.A. in Psychology 1970.
- D. Applied Arts - B.A. in Economics.

(R. Keif) The meeting is recessed until 4:00 p.m.

R. Keif - Call to order 4:00 p.m., 17 March. Senators present:

W. Anderson	A. Higdon	R. Pautz	V. Wolcott
R. Andreini	C. Johnson	C. Piper	
A. Andreoli	R. Keif	M. Pfeiffer	
R. Asbury	D. Koberg	D. Price	
F. Clogston	L. Lewellyn	R. Ratcliffe	
D. Federer	B. Loughran	A. Rosen	
H. Finch	H. Miles	E. Smith	



Meeting of March 17 1969  
4:00 pm

-7

M/S/U

D. Grant/C. Fisher

To amend to make the "minor" more permissive by changing "shall" to "may" and changing 15 units to 9 units in the 300-400 series.

M/S/U

C. Fisher/D. Price

To propose deletion of "#200" following "English" in B-1.

The document of revised guidelines for majors, options and concentrations was accepted, not unanimously, but without strong dissent, with the two amendments:

1. reduction of minors from 15 to 9 units in the 300-400 series,
2. deletion of "#200" following "English" under B-1.

7. M/S

R. Andreini/H. Walker

To update the Academic Master Plan by enhancement of curriculum as follows:

(To be presented to the Senate individually.)

- A. Agriculture - B.S. in Maricultural Engineering 1973.
- B. Engineering - B.S. in Measurement Science.
- C. Applied Arts - B.A. in Psychology 1970.
- D. Applied Arts - B.A. in Economics.

(R. Keif) The meeting is recessed until 4:00 p.m.

R. Keif - Call to order 4:00 p.m., 17 March. Senators present:

W. Anderson	A. Higdon	R. Pautz	V. Wolcott
R. Andreini	C. Johnson	C. Piper	
A. Andreoli	R. Keif	M. Pfeiffer	
R. Asbury	D. Koberg	D. Price	
F. Clogston	L. Lewellyn	R. Ratcliffe	
D. Federer	B. Loughran	A. Rosen	
H. Finch	H. Miles	E. Smith	

Senators present: (Cont'd.)

C. Fisher	B. Mounts	J. Stuart
R. Frost	K. Murray(ASI)	H. Walker
V. Gates	D. Nickell	R. Wheeler
	L. Osteyee	

Guests:

B. Roberts	F. Tellew	W. Curtis
R. Carsel	L. Lamouria	A. Butzbach
O. Servatius	W. Schroeder	

(R. Keif) (Nonverbatim) The Academic Master Plan is the projected desire of a given campus. The details are shaded into sharper focus by annual review and revision. The President's annual recommendation receives input from the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. The Chancellor collates the various campus plans into a package that is received by and acted upon by the CSC Board of Trustees.

An OK from the latter grants a license to pursue, but is not an assurance of the reality of a program. It is also permissible to look beyond the five year limit into the "blue sky area of intent". This allows one to informally stake a claim.

(A. Rosen) Procedurally, what committee of the Academic Senate should first have offered input?

(R. Keif) Historically, none; the F-S Council was invited to react last year for the very first time.

(V. Wolcott) Was this in the past allied with the enrollment limitation study?

(R. Keif) Is there a positive relationship between the Master Plan and enrollment ceiling?

(C. Johnson) We must relate curriculum offering to the ceiling as of that time.

(R. Andreini) The Trustees have the final determination; however, they change the enrollment figures as often as they approach them. This should not deter us from planning the best possible college and leave the means whereby it is accomplished to those charged with that responsibility.

(Gist of the dialogue between Andreini, Andrews, Fisher, Keif and Wolcott: Action this year merely updates the report of last year

on file in the Chancellor's Office; therefore, any suggested change relates to that document. Our consideration should consider the 12,000 FTE limitation. The physical master plan cannot be approached without this preceding Academic Master Plan.)

(W. Anderson) Is the college image and emphasis being considered beyond mere numbers?

(R. Keif) Are Trustees interested in "mix"?

(D. Andrews) To some extent.

(J. Stuart) How will this pie of 12,000 be cut as to various schools? Shouldn't some decision be recommended by this group as to numbers?

(R. Keif) If numbers were extrapolated by trend of past "X years", do you think we could accept the figures?

(J. Stuart) Those numbers should be known prior to a consideration of the type program.

(C. Fisher) Extrapolation is not possible--e.g. percentage of physicist for student body of 10,000 will not remain the same percentage for 20,000.

M/no second

C. Fisher

To accept Academic Master Plan by deleting Psychology, Economics and by limiting Measurement Science.

Meeting recessed till 3:15 p.m. Thursday, 27 March.

A. Meeting reconvened March 27, 1969 by Chairman, Rod Keif.

B. Senators in attendance:

W. Alexander	C. Cummins	R. Keif	R. Pautz
W. Anderson	D. Federer	R. Kennedy	C. Piper
R. Andreini	C. Fisher	D. Koberg	R. Ratcliffe
A. Andreoli	R. Frost	L. Lewellyn	G. Rich
D. Andrews	G. Furimsky	B. Loughran	A. Rosen
R. Asbury	V. Gates	J. Lowry	C. Russell
C. Beymer	C. Gibson	T. Meyers	E. Smith
W. Brown	M. Gold	H. Miles	J. Stuart
W. Burgess	D. Grant	B. Mounts	H. Walker
E. Chandler	S. Harden	K. Murray	A. Wirshup
F. Clogston	R. Harris	L. Ostegee	V. Wolcott